IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE ELEVENTH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO : 10917 of 1998

Between:

Allam Subba Rayudu, S/o Nagaiah,
R/o 6-3-662/18/A, Jaffar Ali Bagh Lane,

Somajiguda, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 Government of Andhra Pradesh, Represented by its Secretary to Government, Irrigation & CAD (IRR III) Department , Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
2 Chief Engineer, Panchayati Raj, (RWS), Swamy Ramananda

Theertha Grameena Nirman, Bhavan, Erramanzil Colony, Hyderabad -82
3 Superintending Engineer, I &CAD Department ,
Irrigation Circle, Nirmal.
4 Superintending Engineer PR(RWS), Nirmanasoudha , Vizianagaram.
(R4 impleaded as per court order dt. 28/04/98 in W.P.M.P.No.14747/98)

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction more in the nature of mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in refusing to furnish the tender schedules to the petitioner in pursuant to tender notices issued by the second and third respondents in their tender notice Nos:AE-III/SMP/4/97-98 dt. 5/03/1998 and 29/97-98 dt. 25/03/98 respectively in respect of the works for which the petitioner has applied for tender Schedules as illegal and void and consequentially to declare that the petitioner's experience as certified by the Larson & Tubro Limited (L &T Ltd.) duly signed by the Executive Engineer, Panchayat Raj Department and Countersigned by the Technical Adviser to Government in Panchayat Raj Department as the one certificate in conformity with the requirement contemplated in the tender notices issued by the Respondent No.2 and 3 and consequentially to direct the respondents to issue the tender schedules to the petitioner and to consider the tender rates quoted by the petitioner there on along others before entering into any contract or execution of the works in question by the respondents 2 and 3 with any third parties.

Counsel for the Petitioner: Mr..MUMMANENI.SRINIVASA RAO

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ & RURAL DEV.

The Court made the following :

O R D E R:

It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the subject matter in the writ petition has become infructuous.

Recording the submission made by the learned counsel, the Writ Petition is dismissed as having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

N.V.RAMANA, J

March 11, 2005.

BCS

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

// TRUE COPY //

SECTION OFFICER

To

1. The Secretary to Government of Andhra Pradesh, Irrigation & CAD (IRR III) Department , Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
2. The Chief Engineer, Panchayati Raj, (RWS), Swamy Ramananda Theertha Grameena Nirman, Bhavan, Erramanzil Colony, Hyderabad – 82
3. The Superintending Engineer, I &CAD Department , Irrigation Circle, Nirmal.
4. Superintending Engineer PR(RWS), Nirmanasoudha , Vizianagaram.
5. Two CCs to G.P. for Panchayat Raj and Rural Development,
6. A.P. High Court Buildings, Hyderabad.(OUT)
7. Two C.D.copies.